REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 13-30 remain in the present application. Claims 23-30 are added herein. Claims 1-10 and 13-22 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim additions and amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-10

Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,327,592 to Yoshikawa (hereafter referred to as "Yoshikawa") in view of United States Patent Number 5,764,317 to Sadovnik et al. (hereafter referred to as "Sadovnik"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-10 are not rendered obvious by Yoshikawa in view of Sadovnik for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites a method of displaying spreadsheet objects of at least one spreadsheet on a multi-layer display comprising a first display screen and a second display screen comprising (emphasis added):

> assigning a first screen designation code to a first spreadsheet object, said first screen designation code associated with said first display screen;
> assigning a second screen designation code to a second spreadsheet object, said second screen designation code associated with said second display screen; and
> simultaneously displaying said first and second spreadsheet objects in accordance with an assigned screen designation code.

Claims 2, 4-7 and 9-10 depend from independent Claim 1 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that Yoshikawa fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "assigning a first screen designation code to a first spreadsheet object, said first screen designation code associated with said first display screen" and "assigning a second screen designation code to a second spreadsheet object, said second screen designation code associated with said second display screen" as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, screen designation codes are assigned to spreadsheet objects, where each screen designation code is associated with a display screen of a multi-layer display.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Yoshikawa of a multi-layer display screen as acknowledged by page 3 of the rejection, nor do Applicants find any teaching or suggestion of screen designation codes associated with a display screen as claimed. The rejection points to tables 606 and 607 of Figure 7 of Yoshikawa as being assigned screen designation codes as claimed. However, Yoshikawa teaches that tables 606 and 607 are displayed on the *same* display screen (Figure 7; col. 9, lines 38-51). As such, assuming arguendo that screen designation codes are assigned to tables 606 and 607, Yoshikawa teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching that the screen designation codes are associated with the *same* display screen instead of first and second display screens as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that Sadovnik, either alone or in combination with Yoshikawa, fails to cure the deficiencies of Yoshikawa discussed above. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Sadovnik also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "assigning a first screen designation code to a first spreadsheet object, said first screen designation code associated with said first display screen" and "assigning a second screen designation code to a second spreadsheet object, said second screen designation code associated with said second display screen" as recited in independent Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully assert that Yoshikawa fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "simultaneously displaying said first and second spreadsheet objects in accordance with an assigned screen designation code" as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, the first and second spreadsheet objects are simultaneously displayed in accordance with an assigned screen designation code. As such, the first spreadsheet object is displayed on the first display screen, while the second spreadsheet object is displayed on the second display screen.

As discussed above, Yoshikawa teaches a single display screen. As such, Yoshikawa teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching display on a *single* display screen instead of simultaneously displaying first and second spreadsheet objects on *fist and second* display screens as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that Sadovnik, either alone or in combination with Yoshikawa, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "simultaneously displaying said first and second spreadsheet objects in accordance with an assigned screen designation code" as recited in independent

Claim 1. In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Sadovnik teaches that images are sequentially displayed on different display screens (Figures 4A-4D; col. 7, lines 53-57). As such, Sadovnik _teaches away_ from the claimed embodiments by teaching *sequential* display of images instead of *simultaneous* display of spreadsheet objects as claimed.

Furthermore, although page 9 of the rejection states that the motivation for combing the multiple screens of Sadovnik with the graphical user interface (GUI) of Yoshikawa would be "to provide the ability to display several layers of related data concurrently and transparently," it is unclear to Applicants why one of ordinary skill in the art would desire to present the GUI of Yoshikawa on Sadovnik's multiple screens. Yoshikawa teaches the display of tables (e.g., 604-608) with no overlap and with sufficient space between one another to view all data in the tables. Accordingly, given that the solution presented in Yoshikawa enables one to view all data in a single layer, it is not understood why one would be motivated to space the tables apart from one another. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection has failed to show the desirability of combining Yoshikawa and Sadovnik as well as used impermissible hindsight in making the combination (e.g., as discussed in MPEP §§2141-2142).

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Yoshikawa in view of Sadovnik, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since dependent Claims 2, 4-7 and 9-10 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in independent Claim 1, dependent Claims 2, 4-7 and 9-10 are also not rendered obvious by Yoshikawa in view of Sadovnik. Therefore, Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-10 are allowable.

<u>Claims 13-22</u>

Claims 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,859,907 to McGarry (hereafter referred to as "McGarry") in view of Sadovnik. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 13-22 are not rendered obvious by McGarry in view of Sadovnik for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully assert that McGarry fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "assigning a first screen designation code to a first spreadsheet object, said first screen designation code associated with said first display screen" and "assigning a second screen designation code to a second spreadsheet object, said second screen designation code associated with said second display screen" as recited in independent Claims 1 and 18. As recited and described in the present application, screen designation codes are assigned to spreadsheet objects, where each screen designation code is associated with a display screen of a multi-layer display.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in McGarry of a multi-layer display screen as acknowledged by page 5 of the rejection, nor do Applicants find any teaching or suggestion of screen designation codes associated with a display screen as claimed. The rejection points to the portions of data shown in Figure 2 of McGarry as being assigned screen designation codes as claimed. However, McGarry teaches that the portions of data is displayed on the *same* display screen (Figure 2; col. 1, lines 64-67). As such, assuming arguendo that screen

designation codes are assigned to the portions of data, McGarry <u>teaches away</u> from the claimed embodiments by teaching that the screen designation codes are associated with the *same* display screen instead of first and second display screens as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that Sadovnik, either alone or in combination with McGarry, fails to cure the deficiencies of McGarry discussed above. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Sadovnik also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "assigning a first screen designation code to a first spreadsheet object, said first screen designation code associated with said first display screen" and "assigning a second screen designation code to a second spreadsheet object, said second screen designation code associated with said second display screen" as recited in independent Claims 1 and 18.

Applicants respectfully assert that McGarry fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "simultaneously displaying said first and second spreadsheet objects in accordance with an assigned screen designation code" as recited in independent Claims 1 and 18. As recited and described in the present application, the first and second spreadsheet objects are simultaneously displayed in accordance with an assigned screen designation code. As such, the first spreadsheet object is displayed on the first display screen, while the second spreadsheet object is displayed on the second display screen.

As discussed above, McGarry teaches a single display screen. As such, McGarry <u>teaches away</u> from the claimed embodiments by teaching display on a *single* display screen instead of simultaneously displaying first and second spreadsheet objects on *fist and second* display screens as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that Sadovnik, either alone or in combination with McGarry, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "simultaneously displaying said first and second spreadsheet objects in accordance with an assigned screen designation code" as recited in independent Claims 1 and 18. In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Sadovnik teaches that images are sequentially displayed on different display screens (Figures 4A-4D; col. 7, lines 53-57). As such, Sadovnik teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching *sequential* display of images instead of *simultaneous* display of spreadsheet objects as claimed.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 18 is not rendered obvious by McGarry in view of Sadovnik, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since dependent Claims 13-17 and 19-22 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 13-17 and 19-22 are also not rendered obvious by McGarry in view of Sadovnik. Therefore, Claims 13-22 are allowable.

Claims 3 and 8

Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa in view of Sadovnik and further in view of "Mastering Microsoft Office 2000 Professional Edition" by Courter et al (hereafter referred to as "Courter"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 3 and 8 are not rendered obvious by Yoshikawa in view of Sadovnik and further in view of Courter for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully assert that Courter, either alone or in combination with Yoshikawa and/or Sadovnik, fails to cure the deficiencies of the Yoshikawa/Sadovnik combination discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Courter also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "assigning a first screen designation code to a first spreadsheet object, said first screen designation code associated with said first display screen," "assigning a second screen designation code to a second spreadsheet object, said second screen designation code associated with said second display screen" and "simultaneously displaying said first and second spreadsheet objects in accordance with an assigned screen designation code" as recited in independent Claim 1. Consequently, since Claims 3 and 8 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in independent Claim 1, Claims 3 and 8 are not rendered obvious by Yoshikawa in view of Sadovnik and further in view of Courter. Thus, Claims 3 and 8 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record, and are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-10 and 13-30 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Please direct all future correspondence to the below address:

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

BMF

Dated: 2/23/ , 2007

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060